

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated January 10, 2008.

Claims 1 and 44 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-50 remain pending in this application.

§101 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 was amended to recite a "computer system." It is submitted that that claim 1, as amended, and its depended claims are directed to statutory subject matter. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 44-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 44 was amended to address the rejection. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 44 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 19-23, 27-34, 40-48 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Bodamer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,997). Bodamer is directed at an apparatus and method for accessing foreign processes in a heterogeneous database environment that includes a local database server having a heterogeneous services module to selectively send requests to the foreign processes based on their respective capabilities. (Bodamer, Abstract.)

The Office action cites the foreign database system (FDS) illustrated in Figure 3A in Bodamer to show "a master data server" recited in claim 1. The Office action cites the local server also illustrated in Figure 3A in Bodamer to show "an integrated server" recited in claim 1.

The local server in Bodimer includes several modules configured *to map a particular database operation to a target foreign process*. (Bodimer, Fig. 3A; 7: 9-18.) Bodimer does not disclose or suggest a mapping process that maps one data object (such as a client identifier) to another data object (such as a master identifier). In contrast, claim 1 recites "an integration server, in response to a request from a client to access master data identified by a client identifier, **to map the client identifier to a master identifier**, retrieve a master data object from the master database based on the master identifier, and **map the master data object to a mapped data object** based on a set of mapping rules associated with the client."

Because Bodimer fails to disclose or suggest every element of claim 1, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed.

Claim 19 recites "an integration server, in response to a request from any one of the clients to access a master data object, to retrieve the master data object from the master database and **map the master data object to a mapped data object** based on a set of mapping rules associated with the client so that the mapped data object contains the subset of attributes in a format that can be processed by the client." Thus, claim 19 is patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Claim 20 recites "**mapping the master data object to a mapped data object** based on a set of mapping rules associated with the client." Thus, claim 20 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Claim 28 recites "providing an interface for **mapping subsets of the master data into mapped data** having a format that is acceptable to each client." The Office action cites the following passage in Bodiner to show this feature.

A fourth type of translation is data dictionary translation, executed in a SQL services module 210b within the heterogeneous services module 311 of the local server 202.

Every relational database has its own set of data dictionary tables which store various kinds of information (known as "metadata") about the objects in the database created by

its various users. This set of tables along with views defined on them are together called the "data dictionary." As a user makes modifications to his schema (for example, creating or deleting a table), the local server 202 will keep track of the modification by automatically adding or deleting entries in one or more tables of the data dictionary.
(Bodimer, 8: 9-21.)

As is evident from the passage above, Bodimer is silent with respect to mapping one set of data to another set of data. Thus, Bodimer fails to disclose or suggest "providing an interface for **mapping subsets of the master data into mapped data** having a format that is acceptable to each client," as recited in claim 28. Thus, claim 28 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed.

Claim 40 recites a processor to "**map the master data object to a mapped data object** based on a set of mapping rules associated with the client." Thus, claim 40 is patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Claim 41 recites a processor to "provide an interface **for mapping subsets of the master data into mapped data** having a format that is acceptable to each client." Thus, claim 41 is patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Claim 42 recites a processor to "**map the first identifier to a second identifier** used by the second client to identify the data object; **map the first identifier to a third identifier** used by the data server to identify the data object; query the second client based on the second identifier to determine whether the second client is using the data object." Thus, claim 42 is patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

It is respectfully pointed out that claim 43 is not discussed in the Office action in view of Bodimer. It is submitted that Bodimer fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 43. Thus, claim 43 is patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed.

Claim 44, as amended, recites a processor to "access the master data associated with the object on the database by requesting that an integration server that communicates with the programmable processor and the master data server **map the master data in the master data server to a mapped data set that has a format conforming to rules defined by the programmable processor** and send the mapped data set to the programmable processor." Thus, claim 44 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Bodimer and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Mahajan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,650).

Mahajan discusses a system and method for updating client computer systems that enable client computer systems to be added to the ICDB system without requiring the ICDB system to create client-specific modification files for each client. In this system, continues Mahajan, *data on the server may be arranged in groups based on content and semantics*. One or more of the groups [of data] are assigned to each client depending on the data requirements of the client. Periodically, the server determines the data that has changed for each group [of data] since the last evaluation, and records those changes in a modification file. When a client connects to the server, it requests the modification files for the groups [of data] to which it subscribes, merges the downloaded modification files, filters the superfluous data, and updates its local database. (Mahajan, 4: 15-29.) While Mahajan mentions arranging the data on the server into groups, Mahajan fails to disclose or suggest creating a group of clients or "**placing the first client and clients who sent a set of characteristics that are the same as the first set of characteristics into a client group**; and generating a data distribution path to allow updates of the set of characteristics to be sent to the client group," as recited in claim 39. Thus, because Mahajan fails to disclose or suggest every element of claim 39, claim 39 is patentable and should be allowed.

Claim 43 recites a processor to "**place the first client and clients who sent a set of characteristics that are the same as the first set of characteristics into a client group; and generate a data distribution path so that the programmable processor can route updates of the set of characteristics to the client group**" Thus, claim 43 is patentable in view of Mahajan and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 39.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 7, 12-15, 17-18, 24-26, 35-38 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodamer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,997) in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 7, 12-15, 17-18, 24-26, 35-38 and 49 are patentable and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated above with respect to their respective independent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at 408-278-4042 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
408-278-4042

Date 04-10-08

By /Elena Dreszer/
Elena B. Dreszer
Reg. No. 55,128

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 10th day of April 2008.

Dawn R. Shaw

/Dawn R. Shaw/

Name

Signature